

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-12 are pending in the application. Claim 12 is newly added. Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

It is noted that the Amendment Under Rule 116 was filed on November 13, 2003, which was within two months of the date, November 15, 2003 of the final Office Action. The Advisory Action was dated January 16, 2004. Accordingly, the time for reply to the final Office Action with a one month extension fee is February 16, 2004.

It is noted with appreciation that the Office Action has indicated that claim 4 would be allowable if amended to incorporate the language of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Entry of the Amendment Under Rule 116 dated November 13, 2003 has been requested by the accompanying Request for Continued Examination. The arguments presented in the Amendment Under Rule 116 concern the final rejection of claims 1-3 and 5-11.

This Amendment presents new claim 12, which is modeled as a combination of claims 6 and 10. Thus, claim 12 recites a printer device comprising a plurality of vacuum guides (corresponding to the first component in claim 1) and a printer chassis (corresponding to the second component in claim 1). It is submitted that claim 12 is allowable for the same reasons presented for claims 6 and 10 in the Amendment Under Rule 116. In addition, it is submitted that claim 12 is allowable for the following reasons.

Claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as unpatentable over as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,036,380 to Astroth et al., hereafter Astroth in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,196,672 to Ito et al., hereafter Ito.

As noted in the Amendment Under Rule 116, Astroth lacks the relationship that the first component is formed so that it moves relative to the second component along the length direction. Ito also lacks this relationship. Therefore, the combination of Astroth and Ito lacks the relationship and does not make claim 12 obvious.


The final Office Action concedes that Astroth lacks a vacuum guide, but notes that Ito does, citing Ito's support frame 30. However, Ito's support frame 30 extends across the entire width of the printer and is not divided into a plurality of vacuum guides as recited in claim 12. This distinction is not trivial because the division into a plurality of vacuum guides affords the advantages shown in Figs. 10-14 and described in the specification at pages 8 and 9.

Thus, for the reason set forth above, it is submitted that claim 12 is allowable.

It is respectfully requested for the reasons set forth above and in the Amendment Under Rule 116 that claims 1-12 be allowed and that this application be passed to issue.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: 2-11-04



Paul D. Greeley  
Reg. No. 31,019  
Attorney for Applicants  
Ohlandt, Greeley, Ruggiero & Perle, L.L.P.  
One Landmark Square, 10<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Stamford, CT 06901-2682

(203) 327-4500